

PROPOSITION 300

OFFICIAL TITLE

REFERENDUM PETITION

REFERENDUM ORDERED BY PETITION OF THE PEOPLE

AN ACT

AMENDING SECTION 13-3412, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES; AMENDING SECTION 13-3412, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, AS AMENDED BY SECTION 1 OF THIS ACT; REPEALING SECTION 13-3412.01, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES; AMENDING TITLE 13, CHAPTER 34, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, BY ADDING A NEW SECTION 13-3412.01; RELATING TO DRUG OFFENSES; PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ENACTMENT.

TEXT OF THE AMENDMENT

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

Section 1. Section 13-3412, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended to read:

13-3412. Exceptions and exemptions; burden of proof; privileged communications

A. The provisions of sections 13-3402, 13-3403, 13-3404, 13-3404.01 and 13-3405 through 13-3409 do not apply to:

1. Manufacturers, wholesalers, pharmacies and pharmacists under the provisions of sections 32-1921 and 32-1961.

2. Medical practitioners, pharmacies and pharmacists while acting in the course of their professional practice, in good faith and in accordance with generally accepted medical standards.

3. Persons who lawfully acquire and use such drugs only for scientific purposes.

4. Officers and employees of the United States, this state or a political subdivision of the United States or this state, while acting in the course of their official duties.

5. An employee or agent of a person described in paragraphs 1 through 4 of this subsection, and a registered nurse or medical technician under the supervision of a medical practitioner, while ~~such~~ THE employee, agent, nurse or technician is acting in the course of professional practice or employment, and not on his own account.

6. A common or contract carrier or warehouseman, or an employee of ~~such~~ THE carrier or warehouseman, whose possession of ~~such~~ drugs is in the usual course of business or employment.

7. Persons lawfully in possession or control of controlled substances authorized by title 36, chapter 27.

8. Persons who sell any ~~non-narcotic~~ NONNARCOTIC substance that under the federal food, drug and cosmetic act may lawfully be sold over the counter without a prescription.

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
"for" and "against" arguments.*

Proposition 300

9. ~~The receipt, possession or use, of a controlled substance included in schedule I of section 36-2512, by any seriously ill or terminally ill patient, pursuant to the prescription of a doctor in compliance with the provisions of section 13-3412.01.~~

B. In any complaint, information or indictment and in any action or proceeding brought for the enforcement of any provision of this chapter the burden of proof of any ~~such~~ exception, excuse, defense or exemption is on the defendant.

C. In addition to other exceptions to the physician-patient privilege, information communicated to a physician in an effort to procure unlawfully a prescription-only, dangerous or narcotic drug, or to procure unlawfully the administration of ~~such~~ A PRESCRIPTION-ONLY, DANGEROUS OR NARCOTIC drug, is not a privileged communication.

Sec 2. Section 13-3412, Arizona Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1 of this act, is amended to read:

13-3412. Exceptions and exemptions; burden of proof; privileged communications

A. The provisions of sections 13-3402, 13-3403, 13-3404, 13-3404.01 and 13-3405 through 13-3409 do not apply to:

1. Manufacturers, wholesalers, pharmacies and pharmacists under the provisions of sections 32-1921 and 32-1961.

2. Medical practitioners, pharmacies and pharmacists while acting in the course of their professional practice, in good faith and in accordance with generally accepted medical standards.

3. Persons who lawfully acquire and use such drugs only for scientific purposes.

4. Officers and employees of the United States, this state or a political subdivision of the United States or this state, while acting in the course of their official duties.

5. An employee or agent of a person described in paragraphs 1 through 4 of this subsection, and a registered nurse or medical technician under the supervision of a medical practitioner, while the employee, agent, nurse or technician is acting in the course of professional practice or employment, and not on his own account.

6. A common or contract carrier or warehouseman, or an employee of the carrier or warehouseman, whose possession of the drugs is in the usual course of business or employment.

7. Persons lawfully in possession or control of controlled substances authorized by title 36, chapter 27.

8. Persons who sell any nonnarcotic substance that under the federal food, drug and cosmetic act may lawfully be sold over the counter without a prescription.

9. SERIOUSLY ILL OR TERMINALLY ILL PATIENTS WHO RECEIVE, POSSESS OR USE A SCHEDULE I DRUG PURSUANT TO THE PRESCRIPTION OF A DOCTOR IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 13-3412.01.

Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

Proposition 300

B. In any complaint, information or indictment and in any action or proceeding brought for the enforcement of any provision of this chapter the burden of proof of any exception, excuse, defense or exemption is on the defendant.

C. In addition to other exceptions to the physician-patient privilege, information communicated to a physician in an effort to procure unlawfully a prescription-only, dangerous or narcotic drug, or to procure unlawfully the administration of a prescription-only, dangerous or narcotic drug, is not a privileged communication.

Sec.3. Repeal

Section 13-3412.01, Arizona Revised Statutes, is repealed.

~~13-3412.01. Prescribing for seriously ill and terminally ill patients: definitions~~

~~A. Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, including the federal food, drug and cosmetic act (21 United States Code sections 301 through 395) and the controlled substances act (21 United States Code sections 801 through 904), any physician who is licensed pursuant to title 32, chapter 13 or 17 may prescribe a schedule I drug to treat a debilitating disease or to relieve the pain and suffering of a seriously ill patient or terminally ill patient. In prescribing a schedule I drug pursuant to this section, the physician shall comply with professional medical standards.~~

~~B. Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, including the federal food, drug and cosmetic act (21 United States Code sections 301 through 395) and the controlled substances act (21 United States Code sections 801 through 904), a physician who is licensed pursuant to title 32, chapter 13 or 17 shall document that scientific research exists which supports the use of the schedule I drug to treat a debilitating disease or to relieve the pain and suffering of a seriously ill patient or terminally ill patient before prescribing the schedule I drug. A physician who prescribes a schedule I drug pursuant to this section shall obtain the written opinion of a second physician that the prescribing of a schedule I drug is appropriate to treat a debilitating disease or to relieve the pain and suffering of a seriously ill patient or terminally ill patient. The written opinion of the second physician shall be kept in the patient's official medical file. Before prescribing, the physician shall receive the written consent of the patient.~~

~~C. The allopathic board of medical examiners or board of osteopathic examiners in medicine and surgery may investigate any physician who fails to comply with the provisions of this section and may discipline the physician.~~

~~D. For the purposes of this section:~~

~~1. "Seriously ill" means suffering from a debilitating or life threatening condition.~~

~~2. "Terminally ill" means a person who is seriously ill and who will die as a result of that illness.~~

Sec. 4. Title 13, chapter 34, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended by adding a new section 13-3412.01, to read:

13-3412.01. PRESCRIBING FOR SERIOUSLY ILL AND TERMINALLY ILL PATIENTS; DEFINITIONS

A. NOTWITHSTANDING ANY LAW TO THE CONTRARY, INCLUDING THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG AND COSMETIC ACT (21

Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

UNITED STATES CODE SECTIONS 301 THROUGH 395) AND THE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT (21 UNITED STATES CODE SECTIONS 801 THROUGH 904), ANY PHYSICIAN WHO IS LICENSED PURSUANT TO TITLE 32, CHAPTER 13 OR 17 MAY PRESCRIBE A SCHEDULE I DRUG TO TREAT A DEBILITATING DISEASE OR TO RELIEVE THE PAIN AND SUFFERING OF A SERIOUSLY ILL PATIENT OR TERMINALLY ILL PATIENT. IN PRESCRIBING A SCHEDULE I DRUG PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION, THE PHYSICIAN SHALL COMPLY WITH PROFESSIONAL MEDICAL STANDARDS.

B. NOTWITHSTANDING ANY LAW TO THE CONTRARY, INCLUDING THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG AND COSMETIC ACT (21 UNITED STATES CODE SECTIONS 301 THROUGH 395) AND THE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT (21 UNITED STATES CODE SECTIONS 801 THROUGH 904), A PHYSICIAN WHO IS LICENSED PURSUANT TO TITLE 32, CHAPTER 13 OR 17 SHALL DOCUMENT THAT SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH EXISTS WHICH SUPPORTS THE USE OF THE SCHEDULE I DRUG TO TREAT A DEBILITATING DISEASE OR TO RELIEVE THE PAIN AND SUFFERING OF A SERIOUSLY ILL PATIENT OR TERMINALLY ILL PATIENT BEFORE PRESCRIBING THE SCHEDULE I DRUG. A PHYSICIAN WHO PRESCRIBES A SCHEDULE I DRUG PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION SHALL OBTAIN THE WRITTEN OPINION OF A SECOND PHYSICIAN THAT THE PRESCRIBING OF A SCHEDULE I DRUG IS APPROPRIATE TO TREAT A DEBILITATING DISEASE OR TO RELIEVE THE PAIN AND SUFFERING OF A SERIOUSLY ILL PATIENT OR TERMINALLY ILL PATIENT. THE WRITTEN OPINION OF THE SECOND PHYSICIAN SHALL BE KEPT IN THE PATIENT'S OFFICIAL MEDICAL FILE. BEFORE PRESCRIBING, THE PHYSICIAN SHALL RECEIVE THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE PATIENT.

C. THE ALLOPATHIC BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS OR BOARD OF OSTEOPATHIC EXAMINERS IN MEDICINE AND SURGERY MAY INVESTIGATE ANY PHYSICIAN WHO FAILS TO COMPLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SECTION AND MAY DISCIPLINE THE PHYSICIAN.

D. FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS SECTION:

1. "SERIOUSLY ILL" MEANS SUFFERING FROM A DEBILITATING OR LIFE THREATENING CONDITION.

2. "TERMINALLY ILL" MEANS A PERSON WHO IS SERIOUSLY ILL AND WHO WILL DIE AS A RESULT OF THAT ILLNESS.

SEC. 5. CONDITIONAL ENACTMENT

SECTIONS 2 AND 4 OF THIS ACT DO NOT BECOME EFFECTIVE UNLESS THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS AUTHORIZES THE MEDICAL USE OF MARIJUANA OR UNLESS THE FEDERAL FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZES THE MEDICAL USE OF MARIJUANA AND THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION RESCHEDULES MARIJUANA TO A SCHEDULE OTHER THAN SCHEDULE I. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL SHALL NOTIFY THE DIRECTOR OF THE ARIZONA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE DATE ON WHICH THE CONDITION IS MET.

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
"for" and "against" arguments.*

Proposition 300

APPROVED BY THE GOVERNOR APRIL 21, 1997

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE APRIL 21, 1997.

ANALYSIS BY LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL (In Compliance With A.R.S. Section 19-124)

In 1996, the voters passed the Drug Medicalization, Prevention and Control Act of 1996. The Act allowed medical doctors to prescribe 116 Schedule I drugs, including heroin, LSD, marijuana and certain analogs of PCP to treat a disease or to relieve the pain and suffering of a seriously ill or terminally ill patient.

After the 1996 Act passed, the State Legislature enacted House Bill 2518. Before the 116 Schedule I drugs could be prescribed by a doctor, House Bill 2518 requires marijuana to be authorized by the federal food and drug administration or be authorized by the United States Congress. This proposition and the 1996 Act would conditionally allow a doctor to prescribe a Schedule I drug to seriously ill or terminally ill patients. Before prescribing a Schedule I drug, the doctor would have to document that scientific research supports the use of the drug and would have to obtain from a second doctor a written opinion that prescribing the drug is appropriate. A patient who receives, possesses or uses the drug, as prescribed by a doctor would not be subject to state criminal penalties.

If this proposition passes, doctors could begin prescribing Schedule I drugs, including heroin, LSD, marijuana and certain analogs of PCP, only after the federal food and drug administration approves or the United States Congress authorizes the medical use of marijuana or reclassifies marijuana as a drug that doctors can prescribe. If this proposition does not pass, under state law doctors could continue to prescribe Schedule I drugs, including heroin, LSD, marijuana and certain analogs of PCP, without any further authorization from Congress or the FDA.

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

Arizona Pharmacy Association Ballot Proposition Statement

The Arizona Pharmacy Association urges a YES vote on Proposition 300, keeping HB 2518 in effect. Broadly legalizing all Schedule 1 substances, i.e. LSD, methamphetamine, heroin, and marijuana, is not in the best interest of patients and society. It is bad health care policy. Obtaining Schedule 1 substances is through illegal means, i.e. drug dealers who cannot ensure purity or efficacy. Federal law prohibits the formation of a distribution system, further encouraging illegal channel usage.

Substances identified in Schedule 1 are defined to have high potential for abuse and no accepted medical use. They lack accepted information on the safety of their use, even under medical supervision. Providing individuals with a legal defense for possessing illicit substances is not valid to warrant repeal of HB 2518.

The Association urges federal officials to conduct more extensive research of marijuana's medicinal value. Marijuana has been used to treat a variety of disease states/symptoms, but there's insufficient data supporting widespread use. Science should direct our actions.

This is NOT about denying patients access to Schedule 1 drugs to alleviate the pain and suffering of “seriously ill” or “dying patients.” Proposition opponents want illicit

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
“for” and “against” arguments.*

Proposition 300

drug legalization for everyone. Protect yourself, family, and community by voting YES on Proposition 300 to maintain HB 2518.

Nancy Alvarez, Pharm.D.
Legislative Chair
Arizona Pharmacy Association
Tempe

Ken Cross, R.Ph.
President
Arizona Pharmacy Association
Tempe

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

Just say No to Legalizing Drugs

Vote “**YES**” on Prop 300

Just ask yourself:

“Why would anyone object to having a drug go through the normal scientific testing to insure that it is safe and effective before a doctor can prescribe it?”

“Why don’t they tell you that the drugs they want to make available include heroin, PCP, LSD, methamphetamine and more than 100 other drugs that are currently illegal?”

In the two years since passage of Proposition 200, evidence has continued to mount that the “medical marijuana” theme is a Trojan Horse for legalization efforts. It is clear that this proposition is not about providing marijuana to the sick and elderly; it is about legalization of drugs. Richard Cowan, a vocal advocate for the drug legalization movement, is on record with statements which can be summarized as follows: *The key is medical access; once we have medical access, then we will get full legalization.*

As the drug movement proceeds through different states, we see a step-wise escalation of strategies aimed at full legalization. In Washington State, the initiative provided that all Schedule I drugs--including heroin--could be obtained without a prescription. In Oregon, an effort to sell marijuana through liquor stores is ongoing. In Florida, the push is to give immunity to drug dealers.

The would-be drug legalizers in Arizona now operate under the banner of an organization named “The People Have Spoken.” In fact, the people of Arizona have never spoken in favor of legalizing heroin, LSD, PCP, methamphetamine or marijuana. I encourage the people of Arizona to speak now--speak loud and clear: SAY NO TO THE LEGALIZATION OF DRUGS. VOTE **YES** ON PROP 300.

Richard M. Romley
Maricopa County Attorney
Scottsdale

Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the “for” and “against” arguments.

Proposition 300

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

PROPOSITION 300 RESPONSE

Arizona voters must carefully consider if they want to legalize heroin, LSD, PCP, methamphetamine and marijuana, even without medical evidence that these street drugs are safe or effective as medicine.

This is the devious objective of wealthy individuals and special interest drug legalization groups that have spent millions of dollars to influence ballot propositions that take a major step toward drug legalization. The drug legalization advocates claim they only want heroin, methamphetamine, LSD and other schedule I drugs legalized for medical use, but they are unwilling to go through the normal Food and Drug Administration testing process that all drugs must undergo before they can be sold to the public. Why are they doing this? What are they hiding? Why are they unwilling to go through the established scientific process that ensures new medical drugs are safe and effective?

The answer is simple. Drug legalization advocates know that heroin, LSD, PCP, methamphetamine and more than 100 other drugs have been classified as schedule I drugs because they are highly addictive, dangerous crude street drugs that lack medicinal value.

The citizens of Arizona have a great opportunity in this election to voice their opposition to legalization of dangerous drugs--to send the message that drugs are destructive and to oppose the legalization of heroin, methamphetamine, LSD, PCP and other Schedule I drugs. Do not allow a wealthy group of legalization advocates take away your right to have heroin and other Schedule I dangerous street drugs scientifically tested before they can be classified and used as “medicine.” Vote YES on proposition 300 to keep scientific testing and to protect the health and safety of all Arizonians.

Calvina L. Fay
Secretary/Treasurer

S.O.S. Save Our Society From Drugs
St. Petersburg, FL

Terry Hensley
Executive Director

S.O.S. Save Our Society From Drugs
St. Petersburg, FL

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

There is a drug problem in both Arizona and the nation which concerns many voters. During the past four years there has been a debate over the legalization and medicalization of Schedule I drugs which are considered dangerous by the federal government. There are more than one hundred of these illegal drugs, including heroin, methamphetamine, PCP, LSD, and marijuana. People addicted to these drugs are prone to neglect themselves, their responsibilities, their families, their friends, and their jobs.

The use of dangerous drugs is a special concern of employers and employees as it poses a serious safety problem. Their use harms not only the individual users, but also their fellow employees. Scientific research underscores the cost of drug abuse at work as it is reflected in substantially more workplace accidents, worker absences, and decreased productivity.

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
“for” and “against” arguments.*

Proposition 300

We support the present system which requires that before any Schedule I drugs can be prescribed for medical purposes, they have to undergo scientific testing and approval by the Food and Drug Administration. This guarantees that they be safe and effective before they can be used.

Proposition 300 provides an opportunity for voters to express their views and make a statement on drugs. We urge Arizonans to vote YES on Proposition 300. A YES vote will retain the important requirement of scientific testing of Schedule I drugs that is necessary for the health and safety of all of us.

David C. Iwanski
Executive Vice President
Agri-Business Council Of Arizona, Inc.
Phoenix

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

I strongly support a yes vote on Proposition 300. As an anti-drug activist in Arizona since the early part of 1980 I can clearly recognize the influence of the pro-drug legalization lobby’s agenda in the strategy of those in Arizona that wish to “medicalize” Schedule 1 drugs, drugs of no medical value and a high potential for abuse.

There are those who would use “junk” science and anecdotal evidence to support their argument and use compassion as justification to circumvent the Drug Enforcement Administration’s (D.E.A.) scheduling process of drugs.

For many years now the strategy of those who wish to legalize illicit drugs have gathered support and money for their strategy to normalize and medicalize illicit drugs which should remain Schedule 1 drugs. The “red herring” they have chosen is “medical” crude marijuana and now all Schedule 1 drugs which we now see here in Arizona.

Remember laetrile? That was the concoction of crushed apricot pits that was touted as a cancer cure 25 years ago and when put before the court of public opinion, more than half the states legalized its use.

The current rush to medicalize crude marijuana is an example of unproved “medicine” again being put before the court of public opinion and the response to anecdotal evidence. To use a quote by a doctor who was involved in the testing of laetril at the time of the furor, Dr. Charles Moertel of the Mayo Clinic said, “**We have assumed proportions that no other quack medicine has assumed before.**” It would appear that history is about to repeat itself with the medicalization of crude marijuana and other Schedule1 drugs.

Please join those of us in the drug prevention community who see through the smoke screen used by the pro-legalization advocates.

Alex J. Romero
Phoenix

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
“for” and “against” arguments.*

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

In Support Of Proposition 300

There is a major drug crisis in our country and it seems to get worse everyday. Individuals who become addicted to these drugs suffer physical, moral, and psychological harm. In some cases the use of dangerous drugs results in deaths. In many other cases, however, individuals addicted to drugs can not fulfill their daily responsibilities and duties and their actions hurt their families, their schools, and their neighborhoods. Moreover, the threat of dangerous drugs is one of the most serious problems facing our children today.

It is important that we send a strong message to our children and grandchildren of where we stand on the use of dangerous drugs. This unequivocal message is that we don't want them to try or use marijuana, heroin, or any other lethal drugs and that we are opposed to the legalization and medicalization of all so-called Schedule I drugs. There are over one hundred of them, including marijuana, heroin, LSD, and methamphetamine. Our message is to say no to the use of such debilitating substances.

The battle against drugs is a battle for our children. It is a fight to underscore what is right and what is wrong. By working together, we can ensure that the lives of our children are safe, more productive, and free of the drugs that can cripple our minds and destroy our souls.

We the people have the opportunity to express our views on drugs and to record our opposition to the legalization and medicalization of marijuana, heroin, LSD and the more than one hundred Schedule I drugs. We can send a message that these drugs are destructive and should not be used. To keep the present system and to say no to drug legalization, vote YES for Proposition 300.

Nathan Sproul
Executive Director
Arizona Christian Coalition
Tempe

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

ARIZONA ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE STATEMENT ON PROPOSITION 300

There is a scourge in our state -- it is the escalating drug problem. The use of dangerous drugs has wreaked havoc on individuals, families, communities, and schools. Those addicted to drugs suffer physical and psychological harm. Drug use is associated with increases in crime, including homicides and property theft. Members of the law enforcement community have to struggle with the problems caused by these drugs on a daily basis, as do emergency medical personnel who treat victims.

Of particular concern is a class of lethal drugs that are listed as Schedule I drugs by the federal government. There are more than one hundred drugs on this list, the best known being heroin, LSD, marijuana, methamphetamine, and PCP. At present the Food and Drug Administration tests all drugs for safety and effectiveness before they can be used.

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
“for” and “against” arguments.*

Proposition 300

The position of our organization on drug legalization and medicalization is as follows: “The Arizona Association of Chiefs is opposed to the legalization of marijuana and Schedule I drugs without federal (FDA and DEA) approval using bona fide medical and scientific standards.”

Proposition 300 gives voters an excellent opportunity to express their views on this timely and important problem. Because we believe in the need for medical and scientific testing that is provided in our current system, we support a YES vote on Proposition 300. A YES vote is necessary for the health and safety of all Arizona adults and children.

T.J. DeBoer
Executive Director
Arizona Association of Chiefs of Police
Phoenix

D. A. Dobrotka
Executive Committee Member
Arizona Association of Chiefs of Police
Glendale

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

For the past several years there has been a battle over the legalization of more than 100 illicit drugs of abuse for “medicinal use.” All of these drugs of abuse are on a list called Schedule I, and some have names we recognize pretty quickly: heroin, LSD, PCP, methamphetamine, and marijuana. Sadly, we recognize some of these drugs because they’re being grown and “cooked” -- right now -- in our own neighborhoods, and they’re causing such critical problems for our schools, workplaces, and communities.

Without the scientific testing and procedural safeguards that the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval brings us, these are the substances our families will consume as “medicine.”

As Drug Prevention and Education Program providers serving Arizona employers, employees and their families, we know full well the outcomes of drugs of abuse. Studies report that in the workplace, drugs of abuse are involved in 3.6 times more workplace accidents, 5 times more workers’ compensation claims, 2.5 times more absences, and a 33% decrease in productivity.

In a Gallup Organization survey of Arizona employees, measuring the impact drugs of abuse have on the workplace, 65% of employees responded that drugs of abuse affect productivity, 61% considered these drugs to pose a safety problem, 50% said they affect crime on the job, and 43% said drugs of abuse “seriously affect” their “ability to get the job done.”

We support Arizonans Against Heroin and the 87% of registered voters in Arizona who said in a recent poll that drugs of abuse should be required to go through rigorous testing to ensure they are safe and effective. Vote “YES” on Proposition 300 to support a safe, healthy, and prudent approach to medical use of controlled substances.

Linda MacLeish-Jensen
Vice President and COO
Counseling & Family Resources-
EAP Preferred
Phoenix

Susan Jones
Director
Drugs Don’t Work in Arizona!
Phoenix

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
“for” and “against” arguments.*

Proposition 300

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION 300

There is a drug crisis in our country and it is getting worse. The use of dangerous drugs causes physical and psychological harm, and is associated with increases in crime, particularly homicides and property and postal theft offenses. A recent report by the Arizona Center for Health Statistics documents substantial increases in the number of deaths in both urban and rural Arizona over the past ten years from the use of cocaine type, morphine type, and other drugs. People addicted to drugs neglect their duties, their families, their education, and their jobs.

Drug problem solutions should not be confined solely to the federal government, the state legislature, special interest groups, or wealthy individuals who can spend millions of dollars on ballot propositions. Proposition 300 encourages the people to speak in 1998 and gives an opportunity to send a message to all citizens, our young people, and children on where we stand on dangerous drugs.

A yes vote on Proposition 300 registers a message of no on the legalization of drugs like heroin, methamphetamine, marijuana, LSD, and other Schedule One Drugs unless and until these drugs undergo rigorous scientific testing to be sure that they are safe and effective before doctors can prescribe them.

What is at stake here is the very fabric of our state and country. It is about commitment and what we are going to become and what message we send to our children and grandchildren. A yes vote on Proposition 300 lets the people decide and to say no to the use of dangerous drugs.

John McCain
U.S. Senator
Phoenix

Bob Stump
Member Of Congress
Phoenix

Matt Salmon
Member Of Congress
Tempe

J. D. Hayworth
Member Of Congress
Mesa

Jon Kyl
U.S. Senator
Phoenix

Jim Kolbe
Member Of Congress
Tucson

John Shadegg
Member Of Congress
Phoenix

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

Proposition 300

Vote YES

As business leaders, parents and fellow Arizona citizens we encourage you to vote yes on proposition 300, which requires FDA approval for prescription use of Schedule One drugs, including Heroin, Methamphetamines, PCP, and LSD.

When the prevalence of drug abuse and addiction increases, crime rate goes up, prison population rises, and neighborhoods deteriorate as consumers stop shopping in

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
“for” and “against” arguments.*

Proposition 300

areas where they no longer feel safe. In addition, productivity and growth decrease overall when drug use increases in the workplace.

The impact of drugs can be seen in families, where poverty, child abuse and neglect very often result from drug abuse and addiction.

All the above issues not only result in a lower standard of living, but also lead to additional financial and tax burden, hinder opportunities and the quality of life for future generations. We must unite and prevent Heroin, Methamphetamines, LSD, and PCP from circulating freely and eventually becoming as easily accessible as alcohol is now. We can't let that happen. For these reasons we appeal to you to vote yes on proposition 300.

Michael J. Minnaugh
President, Peak Insurance Group
Paradise Valley

John Peterson
Chief Operation Officer,
Peak Insurance Group
Phoenix

ARGUMENT "FOR" PROPOSITION 300

I urge you to support Proposition 300, as someone who is against the legalization of Heroin, LSD, PCP, Crystal Meth and other hard core street drugs.

This measure works at attacking the systems of drug addiction by getting addicts proper treatment and make them sober once again. It establishes drug courts in each county to address cases of drug dependent individuals charged with possession or use of illegal drugs. The purpose of drug courts is to have the judicial system work together toward the common goal of breaking the cycle of drug abuse and its corresponding criminal behavior.

It also allows judges to revoke the probation of drug defendants if they violate the terms of their drug treatment and rehabilitation. In many instances the only successful way to wean addicts off of Heroin, PCP and Crystal Meth is the threat of prison. Without that threat, many of these addicts will thumb their noses at judges and continue to commit crimes to obtain money to purchase the drugs to feed their drug habit.

This measure also ensures that violent drug addicts with previous felony convictions would not be eligible for automatic probation and drug treatment. Obviously, previous attempts for such criminals to clean up their act have failed and the need to lock them up and protect the public is clear.

Proposition 300 is part of a two-prong effort by the state to send a message to the illegal drug dealers and millionaire dope pushers that the citizens of Arizona will not tolerate their attempts to turn our state into a playground for their ill-gotten gains by letting criminal drug addicts off the hook for the crimes they commit while high on Heroin, LSD, PCP, and Crystal Meth. Vote yes on Proposition 300.

John Kaite, Senator
Glendale

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
"for" and "against" arguments.*

Proposition 300

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

I urge you to vote “yes” on Proposition 300.

Illegal drugs and the related health traumas, crime and costs to the family are without a doubt the unrelenting tear in the fabric of society. Every year drug abuse kills 14,000 Americans and costs taxpayers nearly 70 billion dollars. Illegal drugs are a primary factor in nearly 90% of Arizona’s child abuse and neglect cases, and more than 50% of spousal murders are related to drug use. Dangerous drugs such as heroin and cocaine have caused a 41% increase in emergency room drug incidents in Phoenix. Injection drug users account for more than 22% of Arizona’s AIDS cases. People addicted to drugs neglect and often destroy their families, their jobs, and their lives.

A “yes” vote on Proposition 300 protects Arizona from the legalization of drugs like heroin, methamphetamine, marijuana, LSD, and other Schedule One Drugs unless and until these drugs undergo rigorous scientific testing to be sure that they are safe and effective before doctors can prescribe them.

A “yes” vote on Proposition 300 sends the message to all citizens, especially our young people and children, that Arizona stands strong against dangerous drugs. For our future’s sake, please vote “yes” on Proposition 300.

Jane Dee Hull
Governor
Phoenix

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

VOTE YES ON PROP 300

There is a serious national drug problem affecting all segments of society. Our sports community is no exception, as drug abuse has shortened or ended promising athletic careers in many sports at the professional, intercollegiate, and high school levels. Drug abuse prevents athletes from performing to their full potential. In a few cases it has resulted in premature deaths.

Those of us in the sports world want to send a message to all adults and children about the dangers of drug abuse that can cause physical and psychological harm. Those who are addicted often ruin their careers and neglect their responsibilities, their families, and their children. Of special concern are the many drugs on a federal government list called Schedule I. They include drugs like heroin, methamphetamine, LSD, PCP and marijuana. Unfortunately, they are both imported to and manufactured in many Arizona neighborhoods.

Because of the lethal potential of these drugs, we believe that before any Schedule I drugs can be legalized or used for medical purposes, they should undergo stringent scientific testing and approval. This testing is currently done by the Food and Drug Administration, and it ensures that drugs are safe and medically beneficial before they can be used.

In the election of 1998, voters will be given the opportunity to send their own message on drugs. To encourage a safe and sound drug use policy, we urge all Arizonans to vote YES on Proposition 300. A YES vote will keep the current and essential

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
“for” and “against” arguments.*

Proposition 300

requirement for scientific testing of potentially dangerous drugs before they can be used.

Bryan Colangelo
The Phoenix Suns
Phoenix

Michael Bidwill
The Arizona Cardinals
Tempe

Richard Dozer
The Arizona Diamondbacks
Phoenix

Shawn Hunter
The Phoenix Coyotes
Phoenix

Paid for by Arizonans Against Heroin; Stan Barnes, Jr., Chairman

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

SENATOR SOLOMON STATEMENT ON PROPOSITION 300

The drug problem in both Arizona and the country is a very serious one. It affects all areas of society, but as a long-time educator, I am particularly concerned about its impact on our children and our schools. For most middle and high school students the concept of a drug-free society is a contradiction in terms. For many, schools are a place where dangerous substances like alcohol, heroin, LSD and other drugs are sold by classmates on school grounds.

The National Center for Addiction and Substance Abuse has published a recent study with a number of alarming statistics on drugs in our schools and of its negative impact on learning. In it, a national survey of both teenagers and their parents rate illegal drugs as the single most serious problem our teenagers face.

Drugs not only harm the individual users, but also their families, schools, and communities. The drug problem is a complex one that requires continual efforts in education, prevention, and interdiction. Since there are no single or simple solutions, we must evaluate carefully all actions we undertake.. One such action is the so-called medicalization of Schedule I drugs like heroin, methamphetamine, LSD, and marijuana. Our action in this area sends a message to our children of where we stand on drugs.

Proposition 300 provides voters an opportunity for voters to register their views. I believe that the present system of scientific testing and approval of drugs by the Food and Drug Administration before they can be used is necessary for both our health and safety. A *yes* vote supports this system and requires that drugs be safe and effective before they can be used. Show our children we care and vote *yes* on Proposition 300.

Ruth Solomon
State Senator, District 14
Tucson

Paid for by Arizonans Against Heroin; Stan Barnes, Jr., Chairman

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

Argument “For” Proposition 300

As Chairman of Arizonans Against Heroin, I ask all Arizonans to join with me in voting “Yes” on Proposition 300.

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
“for” and “against” arguments.*

Proposition 300

Proposition 300 was placed on the ballot by those who wish to make dangerous street drugs like heroin, PCP, and LSD legal and widely available.

I believe the majority of Arizonans stand against such a policy.

The concerned citizens who have gathered together under the banner of “Arizonans Against Heroin” want the voters of Arizona to know how important this ballot question is to our future. There is an enormous amount at stake, as the eyes of the nation watch Arizona to see if street drug legalization is a concept supported by the traditionally conservative voters of our great state.

Do not be deceived. Proposition 300 is not about compassion for the sick and it’s not a referendum on the political leaders at the Arizona Legislature.

Proposition 300 is about legalizing deadly street drugs. It’s a question of the keeping drugs like heroin off our streets and out of our schools. It’s a question of the hope we have for our children and their health and safety.

As a father, I know the fear parents have when confronted with the prospect of sending children into a harsh and selfish world. As a parent, I don’t want to make it any tougher for my kids than it already is.

On Election Day, Arizonans have the chance to strike a blow against those who would make illicit drugs legal and more available for children.

Please vote yes on Proposition 300.

Stan Barnes Jr.
Chairman, Arizonans Against Heroin
Mesa

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

There is a drug crisis in Arizona and it could get worse. In recent years there has been a political battle in our state over the legalization and medicalization of more than one hundred dangerous drugs. All of these drugs are on a federal governmental list called Schedule I. Some of these drugs are very well known, like heroin, LSD, PCP, methamphetamine, marijuana, while others are less well known. These drugs are both transported to and grown in many of our Arizona communities. Their use causes problems for individuals, families, schools, workplaces and neighborhoods.

As a medical practitioner, I have taken an oath to help people according to the best of my ability and judgment, but never with a view towards injury and harm. I believe that before any Schedule I drugs are prescribed for medical purposes, they should undergo rigorous scientific testing and approval. This scientific testing and procedural safeguards are provided by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), which tests all drugs for safety and effectiveness before they can be used. Before any drug can be used on the market, rigorous testing is needed to ensure that it is safe and effective. As a practitioner of medicine, I support the scientific testing and safeguards of the present system.

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
“for” and “against” arguments.*

Proposition 300

For these reasons, I urge my fellow citizens to vote *yes* on Proposition 300. A *yes* vote will maintain the necessary requirement for scientific testing of potentially dangerous drugs and will support a safe, healthy and prudent approach to drug use.

Richard Horne M.D., Ph.D.
Paradise Valley

Paid for by Arizonans Against Heroin; Stan Barnes, Jr., Chairman

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

We support and urge a YES vote to keep the protections given to all Arizonans by HB 2518. A YES vote is necessary for the continued safety and health of Arizona’s people.

Simply, HB 2518 repealed a provision that would have allowed heroin, LSD, PCP and other dangerous, highly-addictive Schedule 1 drugs to be legally available by prescription in Arizona. It added a conditional enactment provision for the (as yet, scientifically-unsubstantiated) medical use of smoked marijuana that would allow it to be available by prescription only in the event that the U.S. Congress authorized such medical use of marijuana or if the Food and Drug Administration, after research and testing, authorized such use and the Drug Enforcement Administration rescheduled marijuana from being a Schedule 1 drug. The historically effective safeguards, that have served us well in the past, should be allowed to continue to protect Arizonans.

Prop. 300 and its out-of-state promoters continue to try to use Arizona to advance a pro-legalization agenda. This agenda will not only impact Arizona employees and employers but all Arizona citizens, young and old. This should not be tolerated by any of Arizona’s citizens. We should not tolerate such a threat to workplace safety and productivity and our way of life. We hope you will not tolerate it either - that you will say YES to a safe, drug-free and healthy Arizona.

C.E. Edwards
Executive Director
Arizonans For A Drug-Free Workplace
Tucson

Paid for by Arizonans Against Heroin; Stan Barnes, Jr., Chairman

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

Support Proposition 300

From a public health prospective, drugs that are administered in the United States must go through a rigorous review process by the Food and Drug Administration. A “yes” vote for Proposition 300 will ensure that this process continues.

Proposition 300 proposes that all Schedule I Drugs must have FDA approval before they are prescribed by physicians. Currently all drugs on Schedule I (marijuana, LSD, heroin, and others) are deemed to have no medicinal value. Before these drugs and many more are available for the public, the Food and Drug Administration should test and approve them. The goal of the Food and Drug Administration is to

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
“for” and “against” arguments.*

Proposition 300

improve the public health and quality of life by approving drugs that have medicinal value.

Schedule I drugs should not be administered without Food and Drug Administration approval. Supporting Proposition 300 will maintain the integrity of this process.

Barbara A. Zugor
Phoenix

ARGUMENT “FOR” PROPOSITION 300

We’ve come a long way from the days of “just say no” to drugs. In Arizona, voters are being asked to say yes to street drugs and all their devastating consequences. As an organization that promotes and protects families, we ask that you cut through the rhetorical nonsense and vote “yes” on Proposition 300.

A “no” vote on Proposition 300 will accomplish one thing -- legalizing drugs in Arizona. And not just marijuana, but incredibly dangerous drugs like heroin, LSD, PCP and crack. These drugs have no proven medicinal value. Two years ago, drug legalization forces targeted Arizona for an initiative that effectively legalized drugs. Out-of-state, pro-drug forces pumped more than \$1 million into that campaign. By that one measure, the war on drugs was effectively surrendered.

But Arizona voters, once they saw what the measure actually did, voiced immediate opposition. In a poll taken only two months after its passage, 85 percent of registered voters believed that drug proposition needed to be changed, and 60 percent wanted it repealed altogether. Wisely, our legislators moved to protect our community by requiring illegal drugs to have proven medicinal purposes before they can be prescribed. Now we have a chance to support that decision by passing Proposition 300.

By passing Proposition 300, we have a chance to kick the drug pushers out of Arizona for good.

If we allow drugs to be legalized, Arizona will be a magnet for every pothead, crack user and heroine addict in America. Our streets will be war zones, and drug-crazed nuts will place all of our lives at risk.

Remember, a “yes” vote for Proposition 300 is a “no” vote for drugs.

Len Munsil, Esq.
President

The Center for Arizona Policy
Scottsdale

Marion “Mac” Magruder
Board of Directors
The Center for Arizona Policy
Phoenix

ARGUMENT “AGAINST” PROPOSITION 300

ARGUMENT AGAINST H.B. 2518

The Arizona Legislature decided last year that it knew better than the people of Arizona how to deal with the state’s drug problems. The Legislature and Governor Symington enacted two laws to overrule the new drug policies which had been adopted by Arizona’s voters by approving Proposition 200 in November 1996. Now, in this referendum, Arizona voters have the opportunity to teach the Legislature to respect the will of the public.

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
“for” and “against” arguments.*

Proposition 300

Through polling and workshops, the proponents of drug policy reform had learned in 1995 that the people of Arizona do not believe the current tactics against drugs are working. A majority see drug addiction as more a medical than a criminal problem. They also believe that doctors should be able to prescribe drugs such as marijuana when needed to relieve the suffering of seriously ill and terminally ill patients. That's why Proposition 200 was approved by a nearly two to one vote in November 1996.

But the Legislature decided the people were wrong, and passed a law which allowed first offense drug users to be sent to jail rather than treatment and prevented doctors from prescribing marijuana for seriously ill and terminally ill patients. This effort to overrule the Arizona public did not take effect because thousands of Arizonans signed referendum petitions. This referendum allows voters to send the message that the Arizona Legislature is the servant of the Arizona public, not the master. The Arizona public has the final word in setting the public policy of this state, not the Legislature. Vote NO on this referendum to assure that the Legislature does not further thwart the public will.

John Norton
Former U.S. Deputy Secretary
of Agriculture
Chairman, The People Have Spoken -
HB2518
Paradise Valley

Marvin S. Cohen
Former Chairman,
Civil Aeronautics Board
Treasurer, The People Have Spoken -
HB 2518
Phoenix

ARGUMENT "AGAINST" PROPOSITION 300

In 1996 Arizona voters decided it was time to recognize substance abuse as a medical problem, not just a criminal problem, and by an overwhelming margin of 65.4%, passed Proposition 200. This action has received worldwide acclaim as a well-reasoned and compassionate new approach to our failed drug policy. It was featured positively in a nationally televised "Bill Moyers Special" in March of this year.

But, in a display of just how far we have strayed from the democratic principles on which our nation was founded, the Arizona legislators decided their opinions are more correct than ours. With wording in the double-talk that politicians have elevated to an art form, they passed two bills which, once translated into plain English, gut the initiative Arizona voters approved by an overwhelming margin. They were arrogant enough to think that they knew better than two-thirds the people what is best for Arizona. Some politicians have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo approach to drug policy, which has evolved into a welfare program for the political class.

With compassion and common sense, Arizonans said severely or terminally ill patients should be able to get relief from their misery without fear of being arrested, providing they receive written authorization from two independent doctors, citing credible medical research. They expanded treatment and prevention programs to help break the cycle of drug abuse and addiction that is ravaging Arizona's youth. But the politicians decided the voters were misguided in making this decision. They placed higher value on maintaining a rigid, outdated government policy than on easing human suffering.

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
"for" and "against" arguments.*

Proposition 300

We must tell the politicians that, in Arizona, democracy and the will of the people are still more important than the so-called “wisdom” of the political class. We must vote **NO** on Referendum Numbers HB2518 and SB1373, and allow the will of the people of Arizona to stand.

Jeffrey A. Singer, MD, FACS Phoenix	Ross Levatter, MD Phoenix	Rod Silverman, MD Phoenix
Barbara Merz, MD Phoenix	David Gralnek, MD, FAAOHNS Phoenix	Charles Goldstein, MD, FACEP Phoenix
Alan Bornstein, MD Phoenix	Walter E. Koppenbrink, MD Phoenix	Nelson Faux, MD Phoenix
William J. Rice, MD Phoenix	R. Edward Westerfield, MD Phoenix	Joel E. Colley, MD, DABA, FACA Phoenix
Keith W. Cunningham, MD Phoenix	Jeffrey D. Steier, MD Scottsdale	Bernard Barber, Ph.D Phoenix
Mark L. Williams, MD Phoenix	William C. Dykes, MD Glendale	Kimball P. Barnes, MD, FACS Scottsdale
James T. Carver, Ph.D Phoenix	Michael Lubin, MD Phoenix	Robert P. Reisman, MD, FCAP Phoenix
Morley Rosenfield, MD, FRCSC, FACS Phoenix	Lawrence W. Shaw, MD Phoenix	Philip Melmed, MD, DABA Phoenix
Teresa Pavese, MD Awhatukee	Gerald F. Schwartzberg, MD, FACP, FCCP Phoenix	Frederick J. Ginther, MD Phoenix
Scott Holtz, MD Phoenix	Linda Benaderet, DO Phoenix	Stanley R. Friedman, MD Phoenix
R. Thomas Stoffer, MD Phoenix	F.N. Rodriguez, MD, FACS Phoenix	

Paid for by The People Have Spoken - HB 2518; John R. Norton, Chairman

ARGUMENT “AGAINST” PROPOSITION 300

The ultimate test of a democracy is whether a citizen’s vote actually counts.

There is a disturbing trend in Arizona in which citizens pass initiatives by overwhelming margins, only to watch the legislature turn around within months and gut what the voters passed. This has occurred on numerous issues, including drug policy reform, health care, and the environment.

Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the “for” and “against” arguments.

Proposition 300

I don't agree with every initiative that has passed in Arizona, but I fundamentally believe that the politicians at the legislature have no right to thwart the mandate of voters. We must honor the will of the people.

Through two bills, the legislature repealed and severely amended Proposition 200 which dealt with medical marijuana and treatment diversion programs for drug users. Even though I opposed this ballot measure, I am opposed to the legislative repeal of this initiative only a few months after 65.4 percent of Arizonans voting approved it.

I urge you to vote no on the referenda to gut Proposition 200. The will of the people must be respected and the programs they support, even when we disagree, should be given time to work. Only then can the people properly reassess.

Grant Woods
Arizona Attorney General
Phoenix

Paid for by The People Have Spoken - HB 2518; John R. Norton, Chairman

ARGUMENT "AGAINST" PROPOSITION 300

ARGUMENT "AGAINST" PROPOSITION 300

The Legislature in 1997 effectively gutted the "Drug Medicalization, Prevention and Control Act," within months after its passage by Arizona voters as proposition 200 in 1996.. in my three decades of experience with Arizona government, I have never seen a more arrogant act by the Legislature.

As a former Arizona Attorney General and Governor's Chief of Staff, let me assure you that the rhetoric and scare tactics used to justify this legislative arrogance are groundless and wrong. 1996's proposition 200 was a sensible, thoughtful and balanced measure, supported by the late Senator Barry Goldwater, former Senator Dennis DeConcini, and most importantly, by the two-thirds of Arizona voters who voted for it.

The citizens initiative and referendum processes, embedded in the State Constitution since statehood, are a vital part of our treasured heritage of grass roots democracy. What Arizona voters properly agree should be the law must not be ripped apart and discarded almost before the ink was dry. I ask you vote NO on Proposition 300, to preserve the will of the voters and to demonstrate once again that the people are sovereign.

John A. "Jack" La Sota
Former Attorney General
Phoenix

Paid for by The People Have Spoken - HB 2518; John R. Norton, Chairman

ARGUMENT "AGAINST" PROPOSITION 300

In 1996 65.4 % of Arizonas approved proposition 200, the drug medicalization initiative. Within months of the voters' approval, the Arizona legislature repealed much of this initiative and stripped it of some of its key provisions. Upset with politicians thwarting the will of the people, 200,000 voters signed petitions to stop the legislative repeal until 1998, when the issue could be placed on the ballot.

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
"for" and "against" arguments.*

Proposition 300

The issue is now on the ballot. A “yes” vote means agreement with the legislative repeal and amendments. A “no” vote preserves proposition 200 as originally approved by the voters in 1996.

I strongly urge a “no” vote to let the progressive programs created by Proposition 200 continue. From my view as a sitting judge, none of the scare predictions of the legislature have come true. In fact, in March 1998, on public TV in “Moyers on Addiction,” Bill Moyers highlighted proposition 200 as a more effective way of dealing with drug problems than the traditional punitive court system.

A “no” vote will let the will of the people stand and will inaugurate a more progressive approach to the drug menace than simply recycling drug users in and out of court.

Rudolph J. Gerber
Judge, Arizona Court of Appeals
Phoenix

Paid for by The People Have Spoken - HB 2518; John R. Norton, Chairman

ARGUMENT “AGAINST” PROPOSITION 300

The will of the people must be honored. We were among the 65.4 percent of Arizona voters who approved Proposition 200 in 1996. We could not believe it when the Arizona Legislature had the audacity to repeal this measure only a few months after it had been approved.

We supported Proposition 200 because of its new approach to drug control, focusing on reducing drug use demand through expanded drug treatment and prevention programs. Breaking the cycle of addiction will help break the cycle of crime in our neighborhoods. We must get drug prevention to our youth before the streets provide them with a very different drug education.

We urge you to vote no on the legislative referenda to repeal proposition 200. The will of the people must be respected if we are to restore integrity to our democracy. Vote No. Let the will of the people stand.

Minister Gregory Coleman Glendale	Pastor Henry Barnwell Phoenix	A.J. Miller Phoenix
Minister Victor Rushing Phoenix	Elder Vincent Bonds Phoenix	Pastor Arthur Strong Phoenix
Arter Johnson Phoenix	Minister Welton M. Jefferson Phoenix	Gene Blue Phoenix
Yolanda Strayhand Glendale	Elder Jerry Boyd Mesa	Pastor Glen Dennard Phoenix
Pastor Othell T. Newbill Phoenix	Minister Lummie Russell Phoenix	Pastor Arthur Lee Tempe
Pastor Sam Henry Phoenix		

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
“for” and “against” arguments.*

ARGUMENT “AGAINST” PROPOSITION 300

In the November 1996 election, 65.4 percent of Arizonans voting approved Proposition 200, the Drug Medicalization, Prevention, and Control Act. Within months, the Arizona Legislature took it upon itself to dismantle the measure. The only excuse the politicians could provide was that they knew better than the voters whom they considered to be dupes.

It’s amazing the arrogance of the politicians who believe the voters know what they are doing when they vote for them, but believe the same voters somehow don’t understand ballot measures. This arrogance has led to numerous legislative attacks on voter-approved ballot measures over the years.

In 1998, you have an opportunity to rebut the politicians’ mischaracterization of Arizona voters by voting No on Propositions 300 and 301. Your No votes will ensure that the Drug Medicalization, Prevention, and Control Act will remain intact the way it was approved by voters in 1996 and send the politicians a clear message that your vote counts.

Vote No on 300 and 301. Let the will of the people stand.

Dr. John Sperling
Chairman, Apollo Group Inc.
Phoenix

Paid for by The People Have Spoken - HB 2518; John R. Norton, Chairman

ARGUMENT “AGAINST” PROPOSITION 300

In 1996, we were among the 65.4 percent of Arizonans voting which supported Proposition 200. This measure was also endorsed by our senior former U. S. Senators Barry Goldwater and Dennis DeConcini. We supported this measure because of its new drug treatment and prevention programs which target our community and because we believe jail space is best reserved for violent offenders, not terminally ill patients who use medical marijuana.

Despite its broad support, the legislature repealed Proposition 200 with careless disregard only a few months after it had been approved. It was as if our vote didn’t really count. They might as well have thrown our votes away at the ballot box.

Don’t let the politicians thwart the will of the people. Don’t let them take your vote away. Vote No on the referenda to repeal Proposition 200. Let the will of the people stand.

Enrique Medina Phoenix	Richard Zazueta Phoenix	Candido Abeyta Glendale
Alberto Chamberlain Phoenix	Jesus Hernandez Phoenix	Edward Valenzuela Tempe
Daniel R. Ortega Jr. Phoenix	Ray Flores Phoenix	Gil Cano Phoenix
Henry Olea Phoenix	Ricky Ricardo Rodriguez Phoenix	Mary Rose Wilcox Phoenix

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
“for” and “against” arguments.*

Proposition 300

Christina Garcia
Phoenix

Teresa Cruz
Phoenix

Ruben Hernandez Jr.
Phoenix

Alfredo Gutierrez
Phoenix

Paid for by The People Have Spoken - HB 2518; John R. Norton, Chairman

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
"for" and "against" arguments.*

BALLOT FORMAT

PROPOSITION 300

**REFERENDUM ORDERED BY PETITION
OF THE PEOPLE**

OFFICIAL TITLE

A REFERENDUM ORDERED BY PETITION OF THE PEOPLE ORDERING THE SUBMISSION TO THE PEOPLE OF AN ACT AMENDING SECTION 13-3412, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES; AMENDING SECTION 13-3412, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, AS AMENDED BY SECTION 1 OF THIS ACT; REPEALING SECTION 13-3412.01, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES; AMENDING TITLE 13, CHAPTER 34, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, BY ADDING A NEW SECTION 13-3412.01; RELATING TO DRUG OFFENSES; PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ENACTMENT.

DESCRIPTIVE TITLE

REQUIRING AUTHORIZATION BY THE FEDERAL FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION OR THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS FOR THE MEDICAL USE OF MARIJUANA BEFORE DOCTORS MAY LAWFULLY PRESCRIBE SCHEDULE I DRUGS, INCLUDING HEROIN, LSD, MARIJUANA AND ANALOGS OF PCP, TO SERIOUSLY ILL OR TERMINALLY ILL PATIENTS IN ARIZONA.

PROPOSITION 300

A “yes” vote shall have the effect of requiring authorization from the Federal Food and Drug Administration or the United States Congress for the medical use of marijuana before it will be lawful for doctors to prescribe Schedule I drugs, including heroin, LSD, marijuana and analogs of PCP, to seriously or terminally ill patients in Arizona.	YES <input type="checkbox"/>
A “no” vote shall have the effect of retaining the provisions of state law allowing doctors to prescribe Schedule I drugs, including heroin, LSD, marijuana and analogs of PCP, to seriously or terminally ill patients without the authorization of the Federal Food and Drug Administration or the United States Congress.	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

*Spelling, grammar, and punctuation were reproduced exactly as submitted in the
“for” and “against” arguments.*